

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
9 **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
10

11 EDWARD L. CLARK, JR.,

12 Plaintiff,

13 v.

14 STATE OF CALIFORNIA, et al.,

15 Defendants.
16

Case No. SACV 22-1390-MWF(JPR)

**ORDER ACCEPTING
MAGISTRATE JUDGE’S REPORT
AND RECOMMENDATION**

17 Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636, the Court has reviewed the First Amended
18 Complaint, the other records on file herein, the Magistrate Judge’s Report and
19 Recommendation (the “R & R”), and Plaintiff’s Objections to the R & R (Docket No.
20 56) and his accompanying exhibits. The Court has reviewed the objections de novo.

21 The Court OVERRULES the Objections and ACCEPTS the findings and
22 recommendations of the Magistrate Judge. The R & R thoroughly and correctly
23 explains why this Court does not have jurisdiction over Plaintiff’s claims. The
24 Objections repeat the same tired arguments. Plaintiff simply will not acknowledge
25 that this Court has no authority to review claims decided against him in the Orange
26 County Superior Court. This Court reached the same inevitable conclusion in his
27 prior federal case.


28 ///

1 ACCORDINGLY, IT IS ORDERED AS FOLLOWS:

- 2 1. Defendants' motion to dismiss is granted.
- 3 2. Plaintiff's claims against the Doe Defendants and Deborah Clark are
- 4 dismissed.
- 5 3. Judgment be entered consistent with this Order.
- 6 4. The clerk shall serve this Order and the Judgment on all counsel or
- 7 parties of record.

8

9 Dated: June 29, 2023

10 
MICHAEL W. FITZGERALD
United States District Judge

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28